	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	08/813,200	HIRANO, MITSUHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven H. Rao	2814
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>Steven H. Rao</u> .	(3)	
(2) Elliot Goldberg.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 March 2002.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1,11, 16 and 18</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>see previous rejections</u> .		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: AR E. Goldberg requested reconsideration of the Advisory Action. After through discussion and review of the prior art, Mr. Goldberg's arguments the Examiner found the arguments not persuasive and concluded that the advisory action is proper		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).		
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORI MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW, action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW reverse side or on attached sheet.	(See MPEP Section 713.04) MONTH FROM THIS INTERV	. If a reply to the last Office //IEW DATE TO FILE A
	0	
Evaminar Note: You must sign this form unless it is an		L
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's signa	ature, if required